

(2)

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL:PRINCIPAL BENCH

Original Application No.1146 of 1999

New Delhi, this the 5th day of November,1999

HON'BLE MR.S.R.ADIGE, VICE CHAIRMAN(ADMNV)  
HON'BLE MR.KULDIP SINGH, MEMBER(JUDL)

Shailesh Mudgil S/o Shri Sushil Mudgil  
r/o XV-2311, Chuna Mandi, Paharganj,  
New Delhi-110005. ....Applicant

(By Advocate: Shri S.P.Sinha)

Versus

Government of National Capital  
Territory of Delhi, through

1. The Chief Secretary,  
Government of National Capital  
Territory of Delhi,  
Old Secretariat,  
5,Shamnath Marg,Delhi-110054.

2. The Principal Secretary(Services)  
Department of General Administration  
and Administrative Reforms  
Government of National Capital  
Territory of Delhi,  
Old Secretariat,  
5,Shamnath Marg,Delhi-110054.

3. The Secretary,  
Delhi Subordinate Services Selection Board  
Institutional Area,Vishwas Nagar,  
Shahdara,Delhi-110032. ....Respondents

(By Advocate: Shri Vijay Pandita)

O R D E R(ORAL)

By Hon'ble Mr.S.R.Adige, Vice Chairman(A)

Applicant seeks a direction to the respondents to lay down an objective criteria in selection of sports persons for Government job and make it publicise before going ahead with the selection procedure. A direction is also sought to the respondents to start afresh the whole selection procedure after laying down the objective criteria to adopt an open and fair approach in selecting sports persons for Government job.

2. We have heard both the learned counsel.

3. Pursuant to an advertisement inviting applications from outstanding sportsmen/women for recruitment to the post of Grade II/Grade IV against sports quota in the Govt. of NCT Delhi (Annexure-A), the applicant applied in response to the said advertisement and was called for a practical test in Basketball on 23.9.98. He states that he kept waiting for the final interview letter and not receiving the same, he filed the OA.

4. Respondents have stated that the aforesaid advertisement was issued to fill up 27 vacancies, in which 343 candidates in 22 disciplines appeared in the trials. Applicant had applied for a Grade-IV post and the criteria for selection tested their <sup>present</sup> performance (Trial Test); sports performance (highest achievement in their respective sport); and personality test. The candidates who attained highest overall marks were chosen. The marks allocated for trial test was 25 marks; for highest achievement in the respective sport was 60 marks, and for interview was 25 marks. The applicant secured a total 50.10 marks in the present performance and sports performance and hence was not called for the personality test because the cut-off marks for being called for the personality test were 53.25.

5. While, no doubt, it would have been desirable if the aforesaid criteria on the basis of which the assessment has been made had been publicised before hand, we find that the said criteria was uniformly applied in

the case of all concerned and we have not been made aware of any cause where a candidate with marks less than the applicant, was called for the interview by ignoring the applicant.

6. Under the circumstances, we find no cause to interfere in this OA and it is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

*Kuldeep*  
( KULDIP SINGH )  
MEMBER(JUDL)

*Adige*  
( S.R. ADIGE )  
VICE CHAIRMAN(A)

/dinesh/